



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,508	09/16/2003	Terutake Kadohara	B588-554 (25815.566)	1754
26272	7590	10/26/2010	EXAMINER	
COWAN LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN P.C.			CUTLER, ALBERT H	
JOHN J TORRENTE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1133 AVE OF THE AMERICAS			2622	
NEW YORK, NY 10036				

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/664,508	KADOHARA, TERUTAKE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALBERT H. CUTLER	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communication filed on August 13, 2010.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. The objection to claim 1 is hereby removed in view of Applicant's response.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (US 6,069,973) in view of TeWinkle (US 7,164,506) and Okisu et al. (US 6,571,022).

Consider claim 1, Lin et al. teaches:

An image sensing apparatus (color copier, 100, figure 1) comprising:
an image sensing element (imaging array, 1, figure 2) includes a first light receiving area (chip 3A) and a second light receiving area (chip 3B) which are formed by a plurality of divisional joint exposure operations (A plurality of chips (3) are bonded together or otherwise arranged to form an array, column 3, lines 62-64. As the first light receiving area (3A) and second light receiving area (3B) are different chips (i.e. formed separately), the Examiner interprets them to be formed by a plurality of divisional joint exposure operations.), wherein a plurality of color filters of a Bayer arrangement are arrayed on the first and second light receiving areas (Each chip (3) has color filters (6) formed over each imaging element (4), and the color filters (6) may be arranged in a Bayer pattern, column 4, lines 31-49.);

a correction device which corrects difference between output levels of pixel signals output from the first light receiving area and the second light receiving area (The data processor (2, figures 1 and 2) provides image signal correction, column 3, lines 31-34. The image signal correction includes chip-to-chip correction (i.e. correction between output levels of respective light receiving areas) wherein the chips are corrected to output uniform image signals, as detailed in column 5, lines 8-16, step 200 of figure 3.).

However, Lin et al. does not explicitly teach that first and second light receiving areas are formed on an image pickup surface of a semiconductor substrate, or that pixel signals obtained by the first light receiving area and the second light receiving area are read out from the image sensing element via a same channel.

TeWinkle similarly teaches an image sensing apparatus (figure 7) comprising an image sensing element ("image sensor array chips", 12) manufactured by a plurality of divisional exposure operations such that the image sensing element includes a first light receiving area ("I", figure 7) and a second light receiving area ("II", figure 7) which are formed by the plurality of divisional exposure operations (A plurality of "sensor array chips" (12, i.e. chips manufactured by a plurality of divisional exposures) are butted end to end to form a single array of photosensors on the substrate (14), column 2, line 64 through column 3, line 4.).

However, in addition to the teachings of Lin et al., TeWinkle teaches that the first light receiving area ("I", figure 7) and a second light receiving area ("II", figure 7) are formed on an image pickup surface of a semiconductor substrate (substrate, 14, figure 1, column 3, lines 2-17), and that pixel signals obtained by the first light receiving area and the second light receiving area are read out from the image sensing element via a same channel (All of the chips (I, II, etc.) are connected in serial such that they are all output onto a "common output line" such that the set of chips "in effect acts as one large chip with a single shift register", column 4, line 62 through column 5, line 12, figure 7.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the first and second light receiving areas taught by Lin et al. connected in serial on a semiconductor substrate such that they read out from the image sensing element via a same channel as taught by TeWinkle as a way of combining prior art elements (i.e. the chips taught by Lin et al.) according to known

methods (i.e. as taught by TeWinkle) to yield predictable results such as the output of image data in a single serial stream (TeWinkle, column 4, lines 66-67).

However, the combination of Lin et al. and TeWinkle does not explicitly teach a control device which controls to write a signal corrected by said correction device to a frame memory.

Okisu et al. similarly teaches an image sensing apparatus (camera, figures 2 and 8) comprising an image sensing element having a first light receiving area (CCD, 12) and a second light receiving area (CCD, 13, See figures 2 and 8, column 6, lines 16-27. Two color image pickup devices (12 and 13) are situated behind the lens (2) to capture left and right partial images.), and a correction device which corrects a pixel signal output from said image sensing element (See figures 8 and 9. The image sensing element (12, 13) outputs signals to an image processor (19). The image processor (see figure 9) contains a shading corrector (194, i.e. a correction device), column 7, lines 61-67. The shading corrector (194) corrects output levels of pixels of the image sensing element (12, 13), column 8, lines 19-22.).

However, Okisu et al. further teaches a control device (card drive controller, 20, figure 8) which controls to write signals corrected by said correction device to a frame memory (Synthesized image data is written to an HD card (10, i.e. frame memory) by the card controller (20), column 7, lines 22-42.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a control device which controls to write signals corrected by said correction device to a frame memory as taught by Okisu et al. in the

image sensing apparatus taught by the combination of Lin et al. and TeWinkle for the benefit of enabling future retrieval and viewing of the image data.

Consider claim 2, and as applied to claim 1 above, Lin et al. further teaches that said correction device divides the light receiving area into a plurality of blocks, and performs correction using a different correction value for each block (pixel-by-pixel (i.e. block-by-block) correction is performed as detailed in step 100 of figure 3, column 4, line 67 through column 5, line 7.).

Consider claim 3, and as applied to claim 1 above, TeWinkle further teaches that the light receiving areas include at least three partial image sensing regions in one direction (see I, II, etc., figure 7). Lin et al. also teaches that the light receiving areas include at least three partial image sensing regions in one direction (see 3A-3D, figure 2). Lin et al. teaches that different correction values are used for individual linear arrays (see claim 1 rationale). However, the combination of Lin et al. and TeWinkle does not explicitly teach that said correction device corrects at least two of the three partial image sensing regions with correction values by using as a reference a central partial image sensing region selected from the three partial image sensing regions.

However, Okisu et al. further teaches:

The light receiving areas (12, 13) include at least three partial image sensing regions in one direction, and said correction device corrects at least two of the three partial image sensing regions with correction values by using as a reference a central

partial image sensing region selected from the three partial image sensing regions (Okisu et al. teaches that three or more image pickup regions (i.e. light receiving areas) can be used, column 23, line 64 through column 24, line 2. Okisu et al. further teaches normalizing the pixel values to the center of a light receiving surface (i.e. a central partial image sensing region), column 9, lines 50-55.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the central image sensing region taught by the combination of Lin et al. and TeWinkle as a reference as taught by Okisu et al. to obtain predictable results such as image data normalized to the central image sensing region while applying a known technique to a known device.

Consider claim 4, and as applied to claim 1 above, Lin et al. further teaches that said correction device performs correction using different correction values in a boundary direction between light receiving elements (Pixel-by-pixel (i.e. block-by-block) correction is performed as detailed in step 100 of figure 3, column 4, line 67 through column 5, line 7. This includes any pixels in a boundary direction.)

Consider claim 5, and as applied to claim 1 above, Lin et al. further teaches that said correction device performs correction using a different correction value for each color (Non-uniformity due to the different color filters is corrected for, as detailed in column 5, lines 8-16).

Claim 6 recites an image sensing apparatus similar to the image sensing apparatus recited in claim 1, and matching features are rejected using the same rationale (see claim 1 above). Lin et al. teaches that the first and second light receiving areas form a single image sensing surface of the image sensing element by connecting the first and second light receiving areas with each other after divisional joint exposure operations are performed in a manufacturing process of the image sensing element (A plurality of chips (3) are bonded together or otherwise arranged to form an array, column 3, lines 62-64. As the first light receiving area (3A) and second light receiving area (3B) are different chips (i.e. formed separately during a manufacturing process), the Examiner interprets them to be formed by a plurality of divisional joint exposure operations.).

Consider claim 7, and as applied to claim 6 above, Lin et al. teaches that the image sensing element outputs a signal from a different output unit for each light receiving area (column 4, lines 18-23), and that a different correction value is used for each linear array and thus each output unit (see claims 1 and 6 rationale).

TeWinkle also teaches that the image sensing element outputs a signal from a different output unit for each light receiving area (A different output (SROUT) is provided for each light receiving area (I, II, etc.) of the image sensing element, figure 7, column 5, lines 4-12.).

Consider claim 8, and as applied to claim 6 above, Lin et al. further teaches that said correction device performs correction using a different correction value for each lens (Correct values are determined based upon received illumination, which is a factor of the lens used, column 4, lines 56-64.). Okisu et al. teaches the use of a lens (2, figure 8).

Consider claim 9, and as applied to claim 6 above, the combination of Lin et al. and TeWinkle does not explicitly teach that correction is performed using a different correction value for each exit pupil position of an optical system.

Okisu et al. further teaches that correction is performed using a different correction value for each exit pupil position of an optical system (Different correction values are used for each pixel, column 9, lines 55-58. Each pixel has a separate lens which has a different optical characteristic, which different optical characteristic would cause different exit pupil positions. See figures 11-13, column 8, lines 47-58.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the correction device taught by the combination of Lin et al. and TeWinkle use different correction values for different exit pupil positions as taught by Okisu et al. to obtain predictable results such as improving image quality while applying a known technique to a known device.

Consider claim 10, and as applied to claim 6 above, the combination of Lin et al. and TeWinkle does not explicitly teach that correction is performed using a different correction value for each F-number.

Okisu et al. further teaches that correction is performed using a different correction value for each F-number (Different correction values are used for each pixel, column 9, lines 55-58. Each pixel has a separate lens which has a different optical characteristic, which different optical characteristic would cause each lens to have a different F-number. See figures 11-13, column 8, lines 47-58.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the correction device taught by the combination of Lin et al. and TeWinkle use different correction values for F-numbers as taught by Okisu et al. to obtain predictable results while applying a known technique to a known device.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALBERT H. CUTLER whose telephone number is (571)270-1460. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu (9:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on (571) 272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sinh Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2622

AC